



514908

MR. T. J. RYAN - INDPLS.

St. Louis Park

Mr. H. L. Finch

November 23, 1970

MR. FRANK HOWARD, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS
PARK - MEETING NOVEMBER 19, 1970

Mr. Frank Howard, Mayor of the City of St. Louis Park and I met for lunch on November 19th to discuss the plant property in relation to the City of St. Louis Park. Mr. Howard expressed his personal reaction to the extension of Louisiana Avenue from south to north through the City of St. Louis Park as generally unfavorable. It was his personal feeling at this time that the increased traffic moving through the center of the city, especially trucks, would not be desirable. At this time his recommendation would be against the purchase of property to provide for the extension.

Mr. Howard asked me if we could control the odors coming from our operation. He expressed that the odor and water contamination were a very much concern to members of the council. It was explained to Mr. Howard that I now felt we were proceeding on a satisfactory program of controlling odor and water emissions. That, by going into the sanitary sewer with our processing discharge and incinerating the odors resulting from our distillation process we would have our main problem under control. Mr. Howard asked when it would be possible for us to complete the installation of this equipment. I informed Mr. Howard that as yet the authority for expenditure for the equipment had not been received. I told him that to make expenditures of the magnitude required for this installation, it would be necessary to know the City's intentions with regard to the extension of Louisiana Avenue. Also, I discussed with Mr. Howard the need for cooperation from the City by not adding a lot of conditions to our attempts to conform as they would only be stumbling blocks and slow us down. As to an exact time of installation I reminded him of the coming winter and the extreme wet weather we've had this fall but that having a clear path without a lot of restrictions we should be able to have our installations completed by June of 1971. It was explained to Mr. Howard that we were now redesigning our proposed sewer connection to include a provision for a meter and a sampling point and then would submit the plans to the City for their approval. Upon receipt of their approval we would then place the plans for bid for construction of the connection to the sanitary sewer. I also explained that it could be possible for us to complete our after burner installation for odors prior to June.

302638

Mr. T. J. Ryan - Indpls. (Page 2)

Mr. Howard felt that the installation of the storm sewer and our connection to the sewer would go a long ways to solving the water problem. He said that City staff wanted to have another study by a concern from Pennsylvania with regard to the contamination of the City's wells. As you will recall they had one preliminary investigation by a hydrologist. Mr. Howard was against another study as I gathered that some report indicated that we may not be the cause of the City well contamination. He felt that it was not necessary to have an additional report even though there might be some question about our contamination as any ecology suit brought against us could be won under today's conditions.

I gathered from Mr. Howard's conversation that if we could clear up the concentrated odors and clean up our water discharge that he could obtain the necessary support from the council to defer the building of Louisiana Avenue. It was Mr. Howard's opinion that there were perhaps only 100 people in the City of St. Louis Park out of a population of about 50,000 that were really strong about the removal of the plant from the community. Mr. Howard explained that he was going to recommend that Mr. Mc Phee and I meet and further discuss the plant situation to try and come to an agreement on what has to be done. I believe Mr. Howard would like to have Mr. Mc Phee report to the council on the progress we are making. Of course, Mr. Mc Phee will be responsible for carrying out the wishes of the council. I would hope that the letter of June 5th from Mr. Churches would not be used as a guideline by Mr. Mc Phee.

The only real reference point to Mr. Churches's letter of June 5th that Mr. Howard made was concerning the ponding areas to the south of the plant. Mr. Howard said that the question of possible removal of the soil in the ponding areas that might be contaminated was an impossible task. And, if through the court action they have instigated, we might be required to remove the land, we would necessarily have to appeal the decision even to the Supreme Court.

It is my opinion that a positive course of action must be taken and recommend that serious consideration be given to the immediate connection to the sanitary sewer and the construction of an after burner for consumption of the odors resulting from the refinery operations. Because of the coming winter and the problems of effectively operating our condenser and scrubbing of fumes from the refinery we need an immediate decision on our odor control.

Yours very truly,

H. L. Finch

HLF:ge

302633